

THE *TAT* PEOPLE IN THE CRIMEA

BY

EDMOND SCHÜTZ

1. The Russian steppes were the site of several successive waves of migrations in the course of history, nomad hordes from Central Asia followed one another in this region. The sedentary cultures of this region were wiped off by these hurricanes, but the tribes who transiently settled on the steppe-land were, on their turn, swept away by newer invaders. Those who were left from the former were incorporated in the new tribal confederations and were used as outpost in the subsequent raids, or were driven to the edges of the area of migrations, to the foothills of the Caucasus and to the Crimea.

The mighty Peninsula of the Black Sea did not belong to the central region of the nomad empires that developed in the southern steppes, nevertheless it was invaded in succession by the Huns, Khazars, Pechenegs, Comans, Mongols-Tatars and the Kipchak tribes, the latter being the main force of the Golden Horde.

The Goths who fled to the Peninsula from the Huns were driven into the mountains, while the southern coast was under Greek, Byzantine and Genoese rule in succession.

Thus the coastal region of the Crimea became a *reservoir* of various fragmentary peoples. Side by side with the great nations, or tribal confederations, in the description of medieval travellers, an ethnic group called *Tat* is mentioned in the Pontic region. This name stands for a people who have been found along the northern shore of the Sea of Azov speaking Greek, along the Caspian Sea coastline speaking Persian¹, and in the Roumanian and Bulgarian parts of Dobrudja speaking Tatar.

V. Minorsky gave a thorough analysis of the history and name of the Tats in his article in the *Enzyklopädie des Islam*, and the researches of H. H. Schaeder yielded a series of new data and solutions to complete the overall picture.²

¹ Minorsky, 757—59; recent works on the Persian Tats: B. V. Miller, *Taty. ich rasselenie i govory*, Baku 1929; A. L. Grjunberg, *Jazyk severoazerbajdžanskich tatov*, Leningrad 1963.

² S. Bibliography.

The word *tat* appears already in the early Turkic sources. The name was first mentioned in the Orkhon inscriptions, but the interpretation of this source entailed many problems. In the sentence *on oq oylina tatīnga tāgi* the word *tat* was first interpreted by Á. Vámbéry properly «Ansässiger, Untertan; settler, subject». W. Thomsen gave a translation and explanation of standing validity: «bis zu den Söhnen der zehn Pfeile (der westlichen Türken) und ihren Tat (ihren Untertanen fremden Ursprungs)». In the new translation of T. Tekin this sentence appears as: «... up to the descendants and subjects of the On Oq».³

Kāšgārī in his *Dīvān* maintained that the term was applied to «Persians» by the Turks (I, 454; II, 280). The wide use of the word *tat* is shown by its repeated occurrence in Kāšgārī's work even in verbal derivatives. The expression *kāfir uyğurī* (I, 39, 16) he used in another passage was given more than one interpretation. H. H. Schaeder, who put forward the most probable one, maintained that here the author does not refer to pagan Uygurs, but to «pagans living in the country of the Uygurs». Summarizing the different shades of meaning Schaeder gave the following exhausting definition to the term *tat*: die nichttürkischen Untertanen des Uigurenstaates, «in der Hauptsache Iranier, sowohl Sogdier, wie Leute vom anderen Ufer des Amudarya.»⁴

Taking into account the importance of the Sogdians in Eastern and Western Turkestan, Kljaštornyj interpreted the ethnic name *Tat* as «Sogdian». This would seem to be an attractive theory since the Sogdians were the closest Iranian neighbours of the Turks. It is, however, contradicted by the separate occurrence of the name of Sogdia in the Orkhon inscriptions, moreover the name of the Sogdians, the main trading partners of the Turks was well known in the Eastern Turkic empires.⁵ Kljaštornyj himself deals extensively with their history in the same work.

After that the name of the *Tats* disappeared from the Turkish literature. It does not occur in the outstanding monuments of the Karakhanid period and is also missing from the classics of the Chagatay literature.⁶ This, however, does not prove its extinction, it was only replaced in literary works with the word *taġik* (and *farsi*) the *tat* anyhow being a popular term of a somewhat

³ A. Vámbéry, *Noten zu den alttürkischen Inschriften*: MSFOu XII (1899), 88; W. Thomsen, *Turcica*: ZDMG 78 (1924), pp. 143 sqq.; Cf. also Schaeder, 5; T. Tekin, *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*, Indiana Univ. Publ., *Uralic & Altaic Series*, vol. 69, 1968: *Bilge Kagan Inscriptions*: BK N 15 (and KT S 12), 281, 263; W. Barthold, *12 Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türken Mittelasiens*, Leipzig 1935, 91, 240.

⁴ K. Brockelmann, *Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz*: BOH I, s.v. *tat*, *tatyqmaq*, *tatla-maq*, *tatlaq*, *tatlašmaq*, pp. 198—199; Minorsky, 756; Schaeder, 2—4, 3; C. Brockelmann, *Alturkestanische Volkspoesie*: Festschrift Fr. Hirt, 19 D.

⁵ S. G. Kljaštornyj, *Drevnetjurkskie runičeskie pamjatniki*, Moscow 1964, 122—123.

⁶ Excepted in the compound titulature: *tat tawgač* and the Chagatay dictionaries compiled at later date. Cf. Schaeder, 7—8, 14.

pejorative shade of meaning. It survived although in the vernacular, as shown by the Chagatay glossaries later compiled.

In the opinion of Klaproth the name was applied to all kind of subjected population, alien to the ruling Turko-Tatar tribes.⁷

In the literature it only occurs in the *Šejere-i Terākime*, Abū'l-Ġāzī's Turkman Genealogy, written intentionally in a popular style. Speaking of the times of the descendants of Oghuz Khan Abū'l-Ġāzī said that «in Iraq, Khorasan and the Maverannahr the rulers (*padišah*), soldiers (*sipah*), and *rayas* were all *Tats*, there was nobody except *Tats*». The region referred to was in fact inhabited mainly by Persians, but this would rather correspond to the state of affairs of the lifetime of Abū'l-Ġāzī himself, projecting later events and conditions back into the undefined era of Oghuz khan, the *heros eponymos*.⁸

Whereas in Central Asia the name *Tat* was replaced by the ethnic term *Taġik*, it survived in the language of the peoples of the Oghuz branch from the Seldjuk period throughout the Ottoman rule.⁹

Among the Chagatay and Ottoman-Turkish lexicographic data the meaning «Persian, Iranian» dominated. E.g. in the *Sanglax*: «*firqa-i tāġik*», according to the *Lehçe-i Osmani* it was applied to the old Iranian and Kurdish populations of provinces absorbed into the Ottoman Empire¹⁰ (Radl. III, 899).

The remark of Z. V. Togan, according to which centuries ago (14th cent.?) the entire population settled in Turkestan was called *Tat*, and the communication of Samojlovič (to Minorsky) that the inhabitants of Khiva were once (einstmals) also called by that name (perhaps as a memory of the old Iranian population of Khwarizm)¹¹ both may reflect a reminiscence of the Chagatay glossaries or Abū'l-Ġāzī's remark.

From the earliest sources on the second prevalent meaning was «settled people» as shown by the examples of the Chagatay dictionaries: «a class of serfs, who do not live in towns and, without being actual slaves (*kul*), are in the service of landed gentry (*akābir*)». In the Kipchak glossaries: «peasant» (*Idrāk*), «villager» (*Bulġat*), «fallah» (*Tuĥfat*).¹²

⁷ Full particulars s. Schaefer, 16—33. — Klaproth: *Zap. Imp. AN XXIV* (1874), 51; cf. Brun, II, 241.

⁸ Kononov, XLI, 56.

⁹ Schaefer, 5—7.

¹⁰ *Sanglax*, 152r; *Lehçe-i Osmani* > B. de Meynard: «surnom donné au population d'origin persan ou Kourde». The quotation in English from: Clauson, 449.

¹¹ Minorsky, 756; Schaefer, 9.

¹² Véliaminov-Zernov, 162; P. de Courteille, 194: «gens de bas étage qui n'habitent pas dans les villes; ceux qui s'attachent à la personne d'un grand, sans faire parti de ses esclaves». Clauson's translation, p. 449. — V. Izbudak, *El-Idrāk Haşiyesi*, Istanbul 1936, p. 46: *Tat* (19): «Türkçe bilmez, dilsiz; arap, farsi». — Zajaczkowski, *Bulġat al-Muštaq*, I, *tat* «étranger»; Atalay, *Ettuĥfet*: *tat* «şehirli; yerli çiftçi». Above, Clauson's definitions, i.e., translations are quoted.

The terming «settled people» involves, to a certain extent, a derogatory meaning, triggered by the feeling of superiority of nomad Turks. The pejorative meaning was perpetuated, and in the course of time, even more stressed: e.g. in the Dictionary of Véliaminov-Zernov: «a class of unemployed roughs», or B. de Meynard «pauvre, misérable, d'humble condition, etc.»¹³

The name *Tat*, both as an ethnic name and in the figurative sense, might be found in the language of the Armenians, the neighbours of the Caucasian Tats. The Tats were known as hard-working farmhands who hired themselves out for temporary agricultural jobs. The social inferiority of the Tats lent a pejorative shade of meaning to the word in this case, too. The Tats spoke a language not understood by the landlords, so it acquired also the meaning «dumb, (or even) mute». This interpretation may also be found in Turkish, e.g. *İdrâk*: «türkçe bilmez, dilsiz».¹⁴ H. Ačarean compared this meaning with the word *nemec* meaning «German» in Slavonic languages and also used for someone whose tongue was not understood being a foreigner. The word *nemec* in these languages was derived from the word *nem* meaning «mute». Schaefer also pointed to this parallelism, the second meaning «barbaric, mute» of the ethnic term *Tat*.¹⁵

The use of the term *Tat* as an ethnic name is not the least equivocal. Besides meaning «Persian, Iranian» it has in the 19–20th centuries reported to denote people living in the Crimea and speaking a Turco-Tatar dialect. Several Russian Turcologists referred to these Tats; according to Radloff: «von den Einwohnern im westlichen Teile der Krym habe ich die Tataren, die nördlich von Sydak wohnen, Tat nennen hören (sonst ist mir der Ausdruck *tat* in keinem Dialekte aufgestossen)». The personal communication of Samojlovič to Minorsky gives an even more detailed definition: «gegenwertig legen die Noghai-Tataren der nördlichen Krim den Spitznamen Tat allen Muslimen der Südküste der Halbinsel bei, die ein Gemisch von türkisierten Volksstämmen sind».¹⁶

Among the officials of the territory of the Crimean Khanate, there was a minister dealing with the affairs of the Tats of the southern coast (*tat-ağası*).¹⁷ This indicates their importance in the region.

The Turco-Tatar language does not define at the same time their ethnic affiliation, original native tongue and origin. An interesting duality is mani-

¹³ Véliaminov-Zernov—PdC—B. de Meynard—Radloff, III, 900. — Clauson 449.

¹⁴ Izbudak, *El-İdrâk*, 46.

¹⁵ H. Ačarean, *Hayeren gawarakan bararan*, 341; see also s.v. *zaza* 315. — Schaefer, 14–15. — Both words: *nemec* «German» and *nema* «dumb, mute» have been adopted separately from Slavic to Hungarian: *német*, *néma*, Knieszsa, *A magyar nyelv szláv jövevényyszavai*, I/1, 354–355.

¹⁶ Radloff, III, 899; Minorsky, 756.

¹⁷ Kondaraki, X, 47.

fested by the population of the colony of Mariupol, where only the Greek people are called Tats, while the Turkish speaking part of the settlement area was called: *bazarian*.¹⁸

In the following it will be attempted to solve these contradictions by the analysis of data hitherto unattended to.

2. The Greek population living in Mariupol and the surrounding villages on the coast of the Sea of Azov had been known in the literature, but it was V. Grigorovič, professor in Odessa, who called attention to the archaic traits in the language of these settlers. In his paper «On the mixed Greek-Turkish population of Mariupol», Otto Blau, who was interested in Turkish linguistic monuments in Greek script originating from this area, included long passages translated into German from the book of V. Grigorovič published in Odessa in 1874, in which he analysed the language of the inhabitants of Mariupol and the surrounding 12—15 villages, called Tats.¹⁹

In compliance with her policy of integration of the Crimean peninsula, after the Treaty of Küçük Kainarji (1774) an ukase was issued by Empress Catherine ordering the transfer of 18 407 Greeks from the southern Crimean coastline into Mariupol and the surrounding villages.²⁰ The Tat settlers came from the area of the orthodox eparchy lying between Čufut-Kale (Kirker) and Sudaq. The centre of the new settlement was named Mariupol (Mariampol) after the valley and village called Marijnoe Selo (Marianopol), known of its Uspenskij Monastery (Dormitio Mariae), on the outskirts of the capital of the eparchy Bakhči Sarai, along the road leading to Čufut-Kale. The names of the villages surrounding Mariupol were derived from their former domiciles in the Crimea, in part after the villages of the area between Sebastopol and Tepe-Kermän, and in part after those around Sudaq.²¹

Data relating to the earlier history of the Greek speaking Tats are known from records deriving from the Genoese era. In these the famous vine-growing region of the Greeks around Sudaq are mentioned. When in 1365 the Genoese recaptured Sudaq from the Tatars, a special clause of the 1380—1381 treaty dealt with the eighteen villages near Sudaq: «Queli dixoto casay li quai eran sotemixi e redenti a Soldaya».²² The name of the tax levied on vine-growing

¹⁸ Grigorovič/Blau, 577.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 576—580.

²⁰ From among the 31,386 displaced Crimean Christian citizens 12,598 Armenians had been settled down in Rostov on the Don river and in the neighbouring 10 villages. Barxudarian, 39. Cf. *Hungaro-Turcica*, 191.

²¹ Grigorovič/Blau, 577; Keppen, 100, 75—78, 43; Kondaraki, I/1, 63—64; Gavriil: *ZOOID* I, 197—204; Vasiliev, 280.

²² In the translation of Silvestre de Sacy: «les dix-huit villages qui étoient soumis et annexés à Soldaja». Keppen, 84—86; Brun, II, 144; Heyd, II, 204—205; Vasiliev, 177—178, 181.

(ambelopatico) also shows that viticulture had been introduced by the Greeks and that it was carried on under the Genoese rule as well.²³

This land around Sudaq was given as an estate in feud to the Hoja Haži Bayram by Batu (Sayin) Khan. This *tarxan* privilege was renewed by the Khan of the Golden Horde, Timur Kutlug (1395—1400) for the descendants of the Hoja in H. 800/A.D. 1396. However, the inhabitants named Tat are not mentioned in this document.²⁴

Vine-growing in the Crimea was not restricted to the region of Sudaq; rich vineyards were to be found everywhere on the slopes of the hillsides in the peninsula. Martin Broniewski, envoy of the Polish king Stephen Báthory, mentions the orchards and vineyards around Kaffa in 1578 with admiration: «vineas, pomaria et hortos fere infinitos illa (i.e. Caffa civitas) habet». His account on the vine-growing area extending for more than two miles next to Sudaq is even more enthusiastic: «vineas, pomaria, quae ad duo et amplius milliaria extenduntur, a Caphensibus, Judaeis et Christianis nunc etiam ibi coluntur. Nam universae Tauricae vinum optimum ibi nascitur». The area of the vine-district in later times extended as far as 40 kilometres, which means that it was practically contiguous to the gardens around Kaffa.²⁵

The fame of Sudaq vineyards remained unmarred in the following centuries. Field-marshal Münnich in his «Tagebuch» opted for the superiority of the wine from Sudaq in respect of both colour and flavour.²⁶

The «Tat» nationality of this vine-growing people is mentioned in a very early record. Hans Schiltberger, a Bavarian soldier who was taken prisoner in the battle of Nicopolis in 1396, visited several countries in the Near East in the service of different Turkish and Tatar lords, as a slave. He also travelled in the Crimea and a very precious account on the Tats is due to him: «Item ein stat haist Karkery und hatt ein guts landt und haist Sutti und die haiden heyssentz Thatt und sein Christen darinn in chrichischem glauben und hatt gut weinwachs . . .²⁷ [There is a town Kirkor and has a good land and is called Sutti and the pagans call it Thatt inhabited by Christians of Greek faith, and has good vineyards . . .]». The name *Sutti* had formerly been emended to *Cuthi*

²³ Heyd, II, 207.

²⁴ Vámbéry, *Uigurische Sprachmonumente*, 172—173; Radlov: *ZVOIRAO* III, 17—38; A. O. Hasan: *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, III, 207—228.

²⁵ Broniewski/Schwandtner, 270, 271; Broniewski: *ZOOID* VI, 348, 347; Keppen, 124; Brun, II, 155; Jakobson, *Sr. Krym*, 118.

²⁶ Brun, II, 156. It is worth mentioning that according to the evidence of Adam Evorka (Jávorka?) French consul of Hungarian origin the vineyards had been tilled with the hard labour of Hungarian captif-slaves. Brun, *ibid.*, Kondaraki, VI, 59; — On the vine production of the subsequent period see: Kondaraki, I, 230; V, 56. — Later in the Potemkin era in the valleys of the Sudaq region left behind by the Greek colonists Hungarian Tokai vines had been planted, Kondaraki, I, 232.

²⁷ Schiltberger, 63.

and Schiltberger's account was considered an important source relating to the Goths in the Crimea.²⁸ The conclusion was drawn by Brun that *Tat* was the Tatar word for «Gothia».²⁹ This explanation was refuted by H. H. Schaeder, who regarded *Sutti* as a form variant or distortion of Sudaq, Sogdaq, Sugda, Soldaia,³⁰ and so the name *Thatt* clearly reflect the wine-growing Christians of Greek faith in the vicinity of Sudaq.

The name *Tat* given to the Greek gardeners living around Sudaq also survived later on, as shown by the Armenian source dating from two centuries later. A peculiar, seemingly territorial term: *Tat'in tun* occurs several times in the Chronicle of Kaffa written by an Armenian priest, Khachatur, reporting on the events of the period between 1615—1648.³¹

The basic meaning of *tun* in Armenian is «house, domus», but it also means «estate, manor». The word *tun* in combination with *Tat'*, apparently a proper name, at first glance I took for the term for an estate of a landlord named *Tat'*. Other passages, of the Chronicle, to be described below, did not contradict this interpretation, as M. Broniewski also accounted on vineyards owned by landlords of different nationalities around Kaffa. However, the word *tun* is frequently used also in a wider sense, in addition to «home» also «homeland» (cf. «Heim — Heimat»). The word *tun* also occurs with such a meaning in the above-mentioned Chronicle referring to larger areas, counties or even countries. For example: *Honac' tun* «the land of the Huns» (160, 41);³² *Frankac' tun* «the land of the Franks» (Malta, in the given case, 224, 03); *Korelac' tun* «Korel — West-Ukraine». Beside the current name for Poland, *Lehastan*, the expression *Lehac' tun* meaning «the land of the Poles» is frequently used in Armenian. The word *Lehk'* (pl. nom.) may in Classical Armenian (Grabar) mean either «Poles», or «Poland». That the word *tun* in this case meant «land, region» is shown by the simultaneously used term *Lehac' erkir* «land of the Poles, Poland» (225, 30, 45).³³ The singular *tat* in the expression *Tat'in tun* may have been misleading, but it should not be forgotten that the names of people are frequently used in the singular in the Turkish-Tatar languages (singularia tantum).³⁴ The aspirated sound did not cause any difficulty in the interpretation, as generally this sound represents the common *t* of Turkish. So the

²⁸ W. Tomaschek, *Die Goten in Taurien*, 5 sq.; Minorsky, 756; even Vasiliev, 193; Pelliot, 155.

²⁹ Brun, II, 236.

³⁰ Schaeder, 10.

³¹ *Manr Žam*. I, 211, 16; 215, 44; 215, 25. See also the «Index hominum et locorum» in the German translation of same, *AOH XXIX/2*, 184.

³² *Hungaro-Turcica*, 199.

³³ *AOH XXIX/2*, 184, 165.

³⁴ Schütz, *An Armeno-Kipchak Chronicle*, 104.

linguistic evidence corresponded to the historical fact that this region was inhabited by Tats, i.e. *Tat'in tun* meant «the land of Tats».

The «land of Tats» (*Tat'in tun*) is mentioned in the following loci of the Chronicle of the Kaffan priest, Khachatur. Locus 211,16: after killing of the Turkish sultan Osman II and the succession of Mustafa I in 1622, the Cossacks raided the port of Kaffa with 33 ships (*qayiq*) and inflicted much damage in the surrounding region as well. «They also devastated the orchards (*baxče*) of the land of Tats». In 1629 the Cossacks again invaded several Crimean cities and also attacked Sughda (i.e. Sudaq) «causing much damage in the land of Tats» (215,44). The purpose of the Cossacks in ruining the Tats' gardens was to cause heavy losses to the Turks by depriving them of the rich agricultural and vine-growing regions under their direct rule, and first of all, make a rich booty.³⁵

The third locus referring to the Tats is in a quite different context. It relates that in 1630 when the *defterdar* (the commissioner of finance of the province) Hasan Agha entered in the tax roll the population of Kaffa, Eski Krim (Solkhat) and the surrounding villages, he was especially fussy about the Tats (216,25–27): *Tat'in tunn gənac' šat aymunk' araw, 4 taroy 5 taroy tyak'n xaraĵ grec' urac'oyac'n xaraĵ iar*. In the German translation I interpreted this passage as follows: «He went to the land of the Tats, made much fuss, put boys of the age of 4–5 years on the tax roll, and took tax (kharaj) from the refusers».³⁶ It was usual in the practice of tax collection by the Turks, moreover the *defterdars* preparing the tax rolls and levying the various services had an outright instruction, to record not only the heads of the families but also their grown-up sons. In this case the *defterdar* committed a severe encroachment in surpassing the age limit by far.

One is inclined to raise doubts: boys of 4 or 5 could hardly have been taxable, and the wicked Hasan Agha might have taken off the boys for (or instead of) kharaj.³⁷ The young age of the boys, under the taxable age, would in itself be insufficient reason to challenge the translation, but surely the first instance many of us would be liable to think of the institution of the *devşirme* (boy toll, Knabenlese). Still in the course of translation I discarded this idea, because the relation of Turks and Greeks seemed undisturbed at that time. But since then I changed my mind.

To augment the ranks of the Janissary corps from the beginning of the Ottoman rule, boys of minor age from the Christian population of subdued countries were carried off as a form of toll. Later this draft procedure became

³⁵ *Manr Žam.* 211, 16; 215, 44, and *AOH XXIX/2*, 142, 148, 166.

³⁶ Hakobian, *Manr Žam.* 216, 25–27; *AOH XXIX*, 148, 137. «Glaubens-verweigender» simply meant: Christians who refused to become converted to Mahometanism.

³⁷ My Polish colleague, Z. Abrahamowicz expressed similar doubts in a letter addressed to me.

a regular custom repeated every five years.³⁸ The institution of *devşirme* is wide-known from the historical sources. Let us now quote the description of this institution by Bartholomaeus Gyurgievits (taken captive in the battle of Mohács) from his eyewitness experience put down in his «Libellus . . . de afflictione captivorum». In the chapter «On the taxes collected from Christians» he wrote: «When the Christian has fulfilled all his obligations, the Turks still have the right to select from among his children the best one, to let him be circumcised, to take him away from his parents and make a soldier of him . . . There are no words to describe the tears, wailing and lament that go with the parting. The father be present to see his son, educated in the cult of Christ, to be carried off to the army of Satan, in order to fight against Christ. The boy is dragged off and has to leave his relatives, pals and friends dear to him for ever and will be drafted in future among those whom the Greeks call father- and motherless (orphans)».³⁹

The possibility of similar events taking place in the land of the Tats made me reconsider the translation of the above cited sentence. I was induced to change my mind, and take the *devşirme* into account in this case, mainly because of the problem of interpretation not of the former sentence, but because of the problems of interpretation of a further passage of the Chronicle (216,34—35), to be explained below.

The expression *xaraǰ grel* could be interpreted in two ways: 1. «to put on the tax roll levied on Christians (*xaraǰ*)», 2. «to put on the forced recruiting list of the boys' toll, Knabenlese». Such interpretation could be reached also by a slight emendation of the text: *grel* might be a mistake for *gerel*. The Armenian verbal part of the construction *gerel* means «to take prisoner» with other expressions *geri arnel* «to take prisoner», or *geri varel* «to drag off into captivity». The mistake of spelling might have been inspired eventually by the initial syllable of a synonyme *grawel* (< P *giraw*) «appropriate, confiscate, etc.».⁴⁰ The carrying off of children into captivity is also mentioned in the

³⁸ Papoulia, B. D., *Ursprung und Wesen der «Knabenlese» im Osmanischen Reich: Südosteuropäische Arbeiten* 59 (München 1963), 85.

³⁹ Jam cum omnia officia praestiterint, adhuc jus est Turcae, optimum quemque ex liberis deligere, quem circumcisu, submotumque a conspectu parentum in militum alit . . . Nemo verbis explicare potest, quibus lachrymis, gemitu, singultibusve, istiusmodi divulsio fiat. Pater filium, quem in cultum Christi educaverat, rapi videt ad militiam Satanae, ut Christum oppugnet: filius abstrahitur a parentibus, perpetuo inter alienissimos victurus: quicquid charum est sanguine, sodalitate gratum, familiaritate amicum, relicturus: postmodum in eorum numero futurus, quos Graeci *apatoras*, et *amétoras* vocare solent. (*Continuatio Peregrini de afflictione tam captivorum, quam sub tributo viventium Christianorum*. In: *Calendarium Tyrnaviense*, ad annum J. Chr. M.DCC.XLI, Tyrnaviae 1741, C 1/r. The rarissime copy received by the courtesy of Mr. L. Tardy.)

⁴⁰ Malxassianc, St., *Hayerèn bacatrakan bařaran*, vol. I. Yerevan 1944, 430, 475; Hr. Ačařean, *Hayerèn armatakan bařaran*, vol. I, Yerevan 1971, 543, 604.

Kaffan Chronicle: in 1621 the troops of the Crimean Tatar Kalgha Devlet Kerei «took many people, men, women and small boys captive» *ayrk' ew kanayk' mantr tyayk' geri arel èr* (210,10). Anyway, in the quoted case the captives were taken in a plundering raid (*sefer*).

The sentence withstanding clear interpretation was: *astuac vrèž araw 3.4 taru tyayoc'n ahn či t'oy* (216,34–35), which in the German translation I interpreted: («on Sunday stones were thrown at Hasan Agha [the wicked defterdar], he fled and only got away with great trouble), God took revenge for the 3–4 years old boys...». When making the translation I wondered why in this passage boys of 3–4 years were mentioned, whereas earlier the Chronicler wrote about 4–5 year old boys. Moreover, the last three words of the original Armenian sentence seemed not to fit into the context. Interpretation of the text was made difficult by the lack of interpunctuation. If, however, we put a semi-colon, or full stop after *araw*, and the words following it regard as a co-ordinate clause, the following verbatim translation can be made: «God took revenge[;] for the 3–4 years old boys no fear was left».⁴¹ I.e. the 4–5 year old boys were carried off as *kharaĭ* (*devşirme*), but when the wicked Defterdar was driven away, there was no fear that the same might happen to the younger children. With this emendation both passages became clear, furnishing further interesting evidence as to the fate of the Greeks around Sudaq under Ottoman rule.

These Greek Tats coming from around Sudaq were then, after the Treaty of Küçük-Kainarĭi (1774), transferred to villages on the northern coast of the Sea of Azov. Since they were inhabitants of the province of Cherson and Sudaq the old Byzantine ecclesiastical (and administrative) unit was preserved.

When in the middle of the eleventh century the Byzantine provinces in the Crimea were endangered by the raids of the Polovtztian-Cuman tribes, the gates of the castle and the citadel were fortified by the Strategos of Cherson and Sugdaia, the Patrikios Leo Aliatés. The inscription dated 1059, carved into a marble cornice testifies to the early existence of this administrative unit of the Greeks of the coastland.

With the Tatar invasion the importance of Cherson diminished; moreover it was completely destroyed by Nogai's hordes in 1299.⁴² Its people must have fled to Byzantium, or rather to more secluded parts of the Peninsula. The nomad Tatars did not invade the south-western part of the Crimea, neither the mountain ranges nor the coastline. The south-western territory was handed

⁴¹ *Manr Žam.* 216, 34–35; *AOH XXIX*, 149. This enigmatic sentence could be solved by the change of the punctuation, similar to the Dodona oracle: *Ibis redibis nunquam peribis in bello*.

⁴² V. V. Latyšev, *Sbornik grečeskich nadpisej*, 15–17. Jakobson, *Sredn. Chersones*, 31. — Tizengauzen, I, 112.

out as fief by Nogai to the Beys of Yaslav (Suleshev) together with the fortress Kirkor, lying in the borderland of the steppe country.⁴³

This administrative unit persevered into the Tatar era, as shown by the document issued by Timur Kutlug in H. 800/A.D. 1396, confirming the land-ownership of the grandsons of Haĵi Bayram Hoĵa. The estate — to which Sudaq and its surroundings also belonged (*Sudaq atliq kántning ĵivari*) — lay, according to this document, in the *tümän* of Qrim and Qirker (Qirq yer, Qirqor).⁴⁴

This shows that the Byzantine administrative centres were shifted by some 25—50 kilometres, from the Byzantine sphere into the Tatar zone or its proximity. The devastated Cherson was replaced by Kirker (Čufut Kale); the later capital was built for a summer residence of the Khan by the end of the 15th century, next to Kirkor. The role of Sudaq was taken over by Eski Krim (Qrim, Solkhat) on the south-eastern nomadic marches. The Tatar counterpart for the administrative term 'province' is *tümän*.

The administrative pattern inherited from the Byzantine era was, at the same time the traditional pattern of church life: the ecclesiastical units coincided with the civil units of administration.⁴⁵

In the ninth century the ecclesiastical units in the territory of Byzantine Gothia were raised from bishoprics to the rank of archbishoprics. They are mentioned as such in the appendix of the chronicle of Georgios Kodinos (*Expositio officiorum Sanctae ac magnae Ecclesiae, juxta eorum ordinem*): No. 16. Cherson, No. 34. Gothia, No. 35. Sugdaia.⁴⁶ With the accession of Andronikos Palaiologos to the throne (1283) they were raised to the rank of metropolises, No. 83. Gothia, No. 96. Sugdaia.⁴⁷

With the devastation of Cherson, i.e. in the Polovtztian-Cuman era Phyllai became the centre of the thema Cherson; the town might be identical with Kirkor, or lay at least in the same area. Phyllai in the 12th century was united with the archbishopric of Sugdaia,⁴⁸ as indicated in the decree issued by Patriarch Lucas in 1158, in which the metropole is mentioned as: . . . τοῦ Σουγδοφούλλων. The act of unification is also shown by the *Explicatio*: Ἡ δὲ Σουγδαία καὶ αἱ Φοῦλλαι, in the Paris edition with the following explanation: Sugdaea et Phullae, duo erant Archiepiscopatus, sed conjunctae

⁴³ Jakobson, *Sredn. Chersones*, 37.

⁴⁴ See note 24. (In the sense of popular etymology misinterpreted by Vámbéry).

⁴⁵ Bertier-Delagarde: *ITUAK*, No. 57, p. 65; Jakobson, *Sredn. Krym*, 82, 124; Vasiliev, 276 sqq.

⁴⁶ Keppen, 42—43, 131; Kondaraki, XVI, 48.

⁴⁷ Keppen, 68; cf. Jakobson, *Sredn. Chersones*, 32.

⁴⁸ Brun, II, 129; Keppen, 131, 179 (n. 272), 308 (The site of the town not being identified yet). The recent view of archeologists: *Ist. i arch. Kryma* 18, 45 (n. 13).

unam nunc Metropolim efficiunt, or in the Exposition of Emperor Andonikos : *Σουγδαία ἦν ὡς καὶ Φοῦλλα*.⁴⁹

The *ex libris* found in the books brought from the old homeland and preserved at the parishes of Mariupol and some of the villages bears testimony to the original ecclesiastical administrative units to which these Tat people belonged : *τῆς μητροπόλεως Σουγδαίας καὶ Χερσώνος*. A Gospel from Yenisola had, according to a note in it, originally belonged to the parish of Kaffa in the eparchy of Sugdaia and Cherson.⁵⁰

This administrative form of eparchies survived and functioned with a validity for the Greeks of Mariupol and the surrounding villages gathered in a much smaller community. Ignatios, the patriarch leading the *exodus* from the Crimea in 1778, had the title of the Metropolitan of Gothia and Kaffa, which meant the conservation of the old ecclesiastical system. The term Gothia was used in order to stress ancientry, and the wide scope of their ecclesiastic jurisdiction.⁵¹

The expression *gothograikoi* (*γοτθογραῖκοι*) frequently occurring in medieval Greek sources should not be regarded as referring to the ethnical composition of the population, it simply meant «Greeks living in the province of Gothia». The mixed population of Sudaq is known from Arab, Byzantine and Genoese sources, but the Tats from the surrounding region must have had Greek ancestors.⁵²

In any case, part of the people living in the coastal region of the Crimean peninsula, got under a strong Tatar influence : they generally used Tatar as colloquial language, dressed in a Tatar fashion,⁵³ but still many, if not all, also knew Greek, although an archaic form which was hard to understand for someone speaking modern Greek, as reported by Archimandrite Gavriil in 1844.⁵⁴

The Tatar tongue failed to supersede the Greek dialect. Hundred years after the *exodus* V. Grigorovič and O. Blau succeeded in recording this dialect as spoken by the great-grandchildren of the emigrants. Greek was not only used for ecclesiastical purposes, in the Greek schools of Mariupol this dialect must have been spoken besides being taught classical Greek.⁵⁵

Summarising, it might be stated that the Tats of Mariupol were the descendants of Byzantine Greek settlers. However their distinction by the Turko-Tatars was based mainly not on their Greek language or special Tatar

⁴⁹ Keppen, 131. Cf. Vasiliev, 276.

⁵⁰ Grigorovič/Blau, 579.

⁵¹ Keppen, 43 ; Jurgevič : *ZOOID* XIV, 5 ; Jakobson, *Sredn. Chersones*, 18.

⁵² Vasiliev, 123.

⁵³ Kondaraki, I/1, 154 ; Heyd, II, 370 («l'élément grec fortement représenté»).

⁵⁴ Gavriil : *ZOOID* I, 203—204.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

dialect, but first of all on their ethnic and anthropological and social characteristics.

3. In the 19th century another group of the Tat people emigrated from the Crimea. These emigrants, speaking exclusively a Tatar dialect, settled in Dobrudja. To throw light on their origin, their past history must be scrutinized.

Extensive archaeological excavations have been sponsored by the Soviet Government to continue the immense work started in the last century to explore the Sarmatian and Alan cultures that existed in this region before the ancient Greek and Byzantine settlements.

These ancient people merged with those who came after them in the next thousand years, and thus must be distinguished from the Alans and Asses mentioned by the travellers on the south-western part of the Crimea in the 13th to 15th centuries. Some of the Alan and Ass tribes joined several of the successive nomad confederations of the age of migrations and got as far as the westernmost parts of Europe, while others merged with the Huns and Avars. Those left behind settled in the southern parts of present-day Russia or were driven to the foothills of the Caucasus or to the Crimean peninsula.⁵⁶

The latest wave of Alans and Asses must have been due to the defeat they suffered from the hand of the Mongols in 1222. When Jebe and Sübötei after having crossed the Straits of Derbend encountered united forces of the Kipchaks and Alans, they succeeded treacherously to confront the allies, and to defeat them one by one.⁵⁷ Some tribes after the defeat fled to the Crimea through the isthmus of Perekop, or through the Cimmerian Strait. This fresh wave might account for the frequent mention of the Alans and Asses in sources relating to the southwestern Crimea in the 13th to 15th centuries.

Alans were sporadically mentioned in the eastern Crimea as well. When Nogai burned Kaffa down, he also captured «Moslem, Alan and Frank» merchants.⁵⁸ The delegation sent by Baibars, the Mamluk Sultan to the Khan of the Golden Horde found different peoples in Eski Krim (Solxat): Kipchaks, Russians and Alans. Alans were continually present in Sudaq, the trading centre of the Crimea up to the 13th century.⁵⁹ The Alans fighting in the army of Nogai might have come from the Kipchak steppes under Nogai's rule, or from among the Alans living in the Crimea.⁶⁰

⁵⁶ Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 361, 368; Czeglédy, K., *Nomád népek vándorlása Nap-kelettől Napnyugatig*: Kőrösi Csoma Kiskönyvtár 8, pp. 33–39.

⁵⁷ Ibn al-Athir: Tizengauzen, I, 23–27; Rašid ed-Din: Tizengauzen, II, 32–33. Cf. Jakobson, *Sredn. Chersones*, 28–29; Vasiliev, 162.

⁵⁸ Baibars: Tizengauzen, I, 112; cf. Spuler, 75.

⁵⁹ Ibn az-Zahir: Tizengauzen, I, 63.

⁶⁰ Pachymeres, V, 236, apud Brun, II, 137.

In the travellers' accounts of the 13th to 15th centuries a region in south-west Crimea was repeatedly mentioned as Alania. According to G. Barbaro, in the Crimea beyond Kaffa, there lies Gothia and then Alania (on the island) extending in the direction of Moncastro.⁶¹ Naturally this description and the kind relying mostly on tradition and use of a customary geographic term also bearing the marks of the ever-changing political situation, cannot be taken for exact geographic definitions. But surely, Gothia stretched as far as Mangup and Eski Kermen, and then came Alania. The definition of Alania by Barbaro was misinterpreted by some historians and geographers because of his mentioning Moncastro: «A poi la Alania, la qual va per la insula verso Moncastro.» But, of course, the region does not mean the *Dikoe pole*, as clearly shown by the adverbial phrase *per la insula* «along the island».⁶²

In the list given by Marco Polo of the lands taken by Batu we find Alania, Gothia and Gazaria. This seems to correspond to the list of Barbaro, but the complete list points to a different region, as after Alania immediately Lac, Menjar, and Zic are mentioned in the enumeration, and only then follow Gothia and Gazaria.⁶³ In this list Alania is grouped among the regions of people living in the foot-hills of the Caucasus. *Lac*-s are found in the Daghestan even today; *Menjar* in all probability stands for the frequently mentioned town Majar, and the *Zic*-s are the descendants of Circassians. So surely in this list Alania denotes the Caucasian territory of the Alans.

The vague geographical term Alania given by Isidorus approximately to the region extending from the Don to the Danube reflects the dominant role of the Alans in the early first millennium.⁶⁴

The Alania mentioned by G. Barbaro clearly refers to the land of Alans in the Crimea. Barbaro knew the classical authors well, he mentions them in his preface (3rd paragraph), and he also knew the accounts of Marco Polo and the other travellers of the Tatar era. He did not draw up the topography of this region to show off his knowledge of literature or to prove how well informed he was. He lived in Tana for 15 years as the trade and diplomatic commissioner of Venice and also knew Caucasian Alania, as he travelled through it during his trip to Persia.

Data on Alania in the Crimea are known from other sources as well. In a list enumerating the bishoprics in 1384, we find the eparchy of Alania

⁶¹ Barbaro, § 51, p. 131, 157. *Alania, la qual va per la insula verso Moncastro*, in the misinterpreted translation of Vasiliev: «Alania, which runs parallel with the island towards Moncastro», p. 219.

⁶² Cf. Brun, II, 137.

⁶³ According to Bratianu the *lac*-s could mean *lesg*-s, *Recherches sur le commerce génois*, 299; in the opinion of Vasiliev the *Menjar* may stand for 'Mingrelians', 168.

⁶⁴ Isidorus Hispalensis: *Patrologia Latina*, LXXXII, col. 504.

besides those of Cherson and Gothia.⁶⁵ Among the earlier sources we might mention more precisely the geographical location of the land of the Alans-Asses in the Crimea: «Kerker . . . is situated in the country of the Asses.»⁶⁶ In the 13th century Kerker and its region came under the rule of the Tatar emirs of Yaslav (Suleshev), fief-holders of Nogai.

Mention of the Alans in the Crimea is often made in the later Turkish historical literature as well. For instance, Ali efendi writes: «*Qırger Sarı Kermän şimalisinda balad Asdan bir qal'adır*. [Kirker is a castle of the Ass country north of Sari-kermän.]»⁶⁷

An authentic account on the Alans around Kirker was given by Theodore, Bishop of Alania (ordained bishop around 1240). His bishoprics also included not only the territory of the Alans in the Caucasus, but also of those in the Crimea. He gave a precise description of the whereabouts of the Alans in the Crimea, moreover of their way of life. According to this account, the Alans had lived around Cherson, and originally been the mercenary defenders of the city and fortress, but by the time of Theodore they had moved to the mountains where they lived scattered in deserted places, in cave dwellings, under primitive conditions; they had neither cattle folds nor huts.⁶⁸

The Alan-Ass troops hired to defend the Byzantine province of Cherson against the successive waves of nomad assaults lost their importance with the end of the Byzantine rule in the Crimea. The caves they inhabited and in which they kept animals, belonged to the numerous «cave cities (*peščernye goroda*)»,⁶⁹ Kirkor and around it. These caves were remnants of localities of the fortresses in the south-western foot-hills erected in the Sarmatian period and later during Gothic and Byzantine rule. As time passed, the superstructure of the buildings and the localities carved in rock — serving military, economic and later, ecclesiastic purposes — have been demolished by the enemy and erosion and so they looked very soon a series of caves.⁷⁰

When making inferences to the numerical ratio of an Alan-Ass population in this area, it must not be forgotten that Nogai had considerable Alan-Ass contingents, and the lords of the district succeeding him (Nogai died A.D. 1300), the beys of Yaslav, were fief-holders of Nogai.⁷¹

⁶⁵ *Acta Patr. Const.* II, Nr. 367 apud Brun, II, 137.

⁶⁶ The Arabic Text of Abu'l Feda, 214; *Géographie d'Aboulféda*, traduite par M. Reinaud, II, 319. apud Vasiliev, 166. Cf. Jakobson, *Sredn. Chersones*, 31.

⁶⁷ Smirnov, 104.

⁶⁸ *Patr. Graeca*, CXL, col. 393; Brun, II, 136; Jakobson, *Sredn. Chersones*, 31; Vasiliev, 167—168.

⁶⁹ Jakobson, *Sredn. Chersones*, 19—20. — Pallas, II, 72; Keppen, 247.

⁷⁰ Vejmar: *Ist. i arch. Kryma*, 48, 52—54. Cf. also Jakobson, *Sredn. Krym*, 50—51, 100, et passim.

⁷¹ Smirnov, 102; Tizengauzen I, 112; Jakobson, *Sredn. Krym*, 128.

Based on the above mentioned sources there has been a tendency in the historical-philological literature to overestimate the role of the Alans in this area, which was most probably due to the automatical linking of the Sarmatan-Alan period with the later Alan-Ass settlers. It must not be forgotten, however, that Crimean Alania, i.e. the territory inhabited also by Alans, bordered upon or rather partly coincided with the western part of *Gothia montana* and that Phyllai, i.e. Kirker (mentioned in connection with the Alans living in the mountains), also belonged to Gothia.

The background of the geographic term Gothia goes back as far as the Hun times. The Goths being defeated by the Huns partly fled to the Crimea. After the death of Attila and the fall of the Hun empire the returning Huns withdrew also into the steppes of the Crimea, and so the Goths took refuge in the mountain region. The exact location of the Goths, later vassals, and mercenaries of the Byzantine empire, as well as the place called Doros, the centre of *Gothia montana*, is still debated.⁷² Doros in all probability might be identified with Mangup or some other fortress in the vicinity, but it was by all means in this region. The term Gothia, the Life of John, Bishop of Gothia, and the local succession of the principality of Doros-Theodoro⁷³ made some researchers think that the Goths continued to live in this territory up to the Turkish invasion (1475) and even thereafter.⁷⁴

The survival of the language would be the most important evidence of their continuous presence. This was thought to be proved by remarks found in the descriptions of travellers, e.g. Rubruk from the 13th century: «Gothi quorum idioma est teutonicum».⁷⁵ In virtue of the verb standing in *praesens historicus*, the statement was interpreted as referring to the times of Rubruk (1253). A. A. Vasiliev translated this sentence as follows: «Goths, who spoke the Teutonic tongue».⁷⁶ In the anthology of Chr. Dawson of the accounts of travellers of the Tatar period the translation of *Teutonicus* was modernised to «German»: «among them were many Goths, who speak German».⁷⁷ The translation I suggest to eliminate the ambiguity: «Gothia, the native tongue (vernacular) of the inhabitants of which was Teutonic» would reflect the non-committal standpoint as to the age. The account of Rubruk was not based on first-hand experience, because he only sailed along the southern coast of

⁷² Vasiliev, 47, sqq. See one of the major sources: the «Life of John of Gothia» (*Acta Sanctorum*, Jun. VII).

⁷³ Bănescu, *Contribution à l'histoire de la seigneurie de Théodoro-Mangoup en Crimée: Byz. Zschr.* XXXV, 24; Vasiliev, 40.

⁷⁴ Tomaschek, *Die Goten in Taurien*, Wien 1881; and others. Against the theory: Jakobson, *Rannesredn. Chersones*, 43, sqq; Id., *Sredn. Chersones*, 18.

⁷⁵ Rubruk/Wyngaert, I, 170.

⁷⁶ Vasiliev, 165.

⁷⁷ Rubruk/Dawson, 93.

the Peninsula (*navigantes coram ea*) and landed in Sudaq, i.e. on the eastern end.⁷⁸

Nevertheless Rubruk, the learned Franciscan friar, gave credit to his informers, having, himself, carefully prepared for the journey by studying the works of classic authors and the reports of missionaries and travellers concerning the geography and ethnography of the region. Thus the name Gothia to him automatically might have suggested the survival of the Gothic people.

Schiltberger's *Reisebuch*, already referred to, is an especially interesting source concerning the Goths and at the same time the Tats.⁷⁹ In the second relevant passage the variants *Kuthia/Ruthia* were interpreted to refer to the Goths, and *Sutti* in the first passage was also emended to *Kuthi*.⁸⁰ On this basis Ph. Brun identified the Tats with the Goths (*Kuthi*).⁸¹ Even A. A. Vasiliev accepted the *Kuthia* variant. Based on these data Tomaschek and others tried to prove the survival of the Goths in the Crimea up to modern times.⁸²

Text analysis, however, disproved these constrained arguments. The *Kuthia/Ruthia* variants turned out to stand for *Churin* (Nuremberg MS), the name of a people in the Caucasus, and it was shown that the place name *Sutti* cannot be emended to *Kuthi*, but should be read *Sugdi* (> *Sukti*), variants of the name of the city Sugdaq, Sugda, etc.⁸³

The continuous use of the term «Gothia» perpetuated the belief in the survival of the Goths. Even G. Barbaro fell for the rumor. He tells us that his servant spoke with Goths: «The Goths speak German. I know this because I had a German servant with me; they spoke with each other and understood each other completely, like someone from Friuli understands a person from Florence».⁸⁴ It is known, that G. Barbaro had never been in the Crimean Gothia. The case of his servant may be explained in different ways. The most plausible of these is that in Tana, where merchants from many different nationalities came together, the servant might have met some Germans (ev. merchants) from the Crimea.⁸⁵

The report of A. G. Busbecq on the Crimean Goths was highly misleading. He based his account on information obtained from two Crimean envoys in

⁷⁸ Rubruk/Wyngaert, I, 165.

⁷⁹ Schiltberger/Langmantel, 63.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 97, 140.

⁸¹ Brun, II, 241.

⁸² Tomaschek: see above, note 74; Pelliot, 155; Vasiliev, 193.

⁸³ Schaeder, 10—11.

⁸⁴ *Gothi parlano in todesco; so questo perchè, havendo un fameiglio todesco, con mi, parlavano insieme et intendevansi assai rasonevolmente, cusì como se intenderia un furlano con un fiorentino.* Barbaro, p. 131, 157. Cf. Brun, II, 236.

⁸⁵ Barbaro, § 51, pp. 131, 181; Vasiliev, 219—220.

Constantinople in 1554, and listed mostly modern vocables.⁸⁶ Scientists of the 19th century have already refuted these arguments for the survival of the Gothic tongue in the 16th century. P. S. Pallas criticized the data of Busbecq as early as in 1793—94.⁸⁷

These and similar accounts failed to prove the survival of the Gothic language. No direct or indirect traces of this language is found in the tongue of the Crimean people, either in that of the Greeks who emigrated to Mariupol, or of the Tatars (Tats) or Turks who settled in the southern regions of the Crimea.

The various ethnic groups merged in this area, from the Tauric aborigines, through the Sarmatians-Alans, Greeks, Goths and Byzantines down to the succeeding tribes of Tatars and Turks. This merging of the population was observed already by Pachymeres in the period of Mihail Palaiologos in the second half of the 13th century: «the Alans, Zikhs, Goths, Russians and other different neighbouring peoples, mixed with them the Tatars; they adopted their customs, assumed their tongue and clothes».⁸⁸ The view of the natural mixing of the peoples is upheld by modern critical historiography. A. A. Vasiliev in his book on the history of the Goths in the Crimea also stated: «the Goths did not survive during the Middle Ages . . . they gradually lost their nationality and their Germanic tongue and were first hellenized and later tartarized».⁸⁹

From the point of view of the ethnic groups of earlier times it is remarkable that Goths and Alans are mentioned side by side in the sources. In a letter written in 1334 by Mario Sanudo to Philip VI, «Gothi et aliqui Alani» are reported to live under the Tatar rule.⁹⁰

That the Goths might have merged with the Alans defending the border of the Byzantine empire and later living on the feudal estate of the beys of Yaslav is shown by the tradition perpetuated by G. Barbaro, who maintained that in the region of «Crimean Alania» «the first inhabitants were Alans, then came the Goths who invaded the country and the issues of this merger of the two tribes call themselves Gothalans».⁹¹ Based on his readings, Barbaro identified the Alans of this conglomeration with those of the Sarmatian-Alan period. This is a good example how historians in the Middle Ages tried to explain contemporary information in the light of classical sources in order to lend

⁸⁶ A. G. Busbequii, *Legationis Turcicae Epistolae*, IV; Kondaraki, VIII, 26; Vasiliev, 269—271.

⁸⁷ Pallas, II, 318; Brun, *Černomorskie goty i sledy dolgogo ich prebyvanija v Južnoj Rossii: Zapiski Imp. AN XXIV*, 51; Id., II, 237—241; Vasiliev, 269—271.

⁸⁸ *Pachymeris Historiae de Michaele Palaeologo*, V, 4. apud Vasiliev, 172.

⁸⁹ Vasiliev, p. V, 220, 275.

⁹⁰ Brun, II, 137.

⁹¹ Barbaro, § 51, p. 157.

historical credit to their statements. Other examples might be found in Plano Carpini, Rubruk and others, who tried to compare contemporary geographical, ethnic and other information with those obtained from their readings. Nevertheless the hearsay of the day under the historical disguise can be readily identified in these chronicles.

There are facts behind the perseverance of this tradition, in addition to the conservatism of the historical-geographical terminology, which deserve attention.

There are no data to prove the survival of this geographical (Alania—Gothia) and ethnographic (Alans—Goths) tradition among the people living in the Crimea at present, but its continuity might be, interestingly, discovered when studying certain characteristics of the Tat people originating from the regions of the Crimea that were contiguous to Gothia, who migrated to the Roumanian and Bulgarian sides of Dobrudja.

The Tatars and Tats have come to Dobrudja relatively late ; the majority settled there after the Crimean War (1854) and live side by side — and even mixed — in Roumania (approximately 21 million) and Bulgaria (approx. 5—6 million).⁹²

The language, ethnography and other features of the Tatars of this region have been studied fairly extensively, while the Tats have been neglected by researchers, because of their numerical inferiority. There is only one thorough study dealing with the language of the Tats by Vl. Drimba, who carried on linguistic research in the Roumanian Dobrudja in 1956—57.

As a result of the migrations, mixing and the strong Ottoman-Turkish influence, it is rather difficult to classify the Crimean Tatar dialects as to the details. However, the language of the Tatars inhabiting the steppes (*čöl*), can be in main lines distinguished from that of the Tatars living in the mountainous region or on the coast, by some of its phonetic peculiarities.⁹³

The largest group of the Tats living in the Roumanian part of the Dobrudja are those found in the Hîrşova and Medgidia districts ; they call themselves *Baidar Tats*. They came from the Baidar valley (*Bajdarskaja dolina*) in the Crimea, from 12 villages in the narrow basin of the Yayla mountain, and settled in the following villages of the Hîrşova district : Roumanian *Haydar* (Tatar *Aydar*), *Dulgheru* (T. *Dülğér*), *Rahman* (T. *Raxman*), *Horia* (T. *Müslübey*), *Crîşan* (T. *Müslüy*), *Băltăgeşti* (T. *Baltaǵı*) and *Tichileşti* (T. *Tekeli*) as well as in the Medgidia district in the villages of *Siliştea* and *Dunărea* (T. *Boyasşiq*).⁹⁴

⁹² J. Blaskovics, *Dobruca Tatarlarının halk türkülleri : Németh Armağanı*, Ankara 1962, 69—70 ; Mándoki, *Devinettes tatares de Bulgarie : AOH XXI*, 369—370.

⁹³ *PhTF*, I, 369, sqq.

⁹⁴ Drimba, 68—69 with a map-sketch.

These Tats left the Crimea when in the course of the Crimean War the English and French army invaded the Peninsula and having captured Balaklava stationed their troops in the twelve villages of the valley.⁹⁵

Another group of Tats came from the region of Ičel on the southern coast of the Crimea. These Ičel-Tats settled in the village *Capidava* (T. *Qalakôy*) in the Hırsova district.⁹⁶

The language of the Dobrudjan Tats differs slightly from that of the Dobrudjan Tatars, and the latter because of these (mostly phonetic) peculiarities ridicule the speech of the Tats.

According to the information from St. Mándoki Kongur, one of the best experts of the Tatar dialects of Bulgarian Dobrudja, the slow, higher pitched and thinner intonation of the Tats differs from the dynamic speech of the Tatars characterised by a strong logical stress. The Tats have a sing-song intonation. According to Kondaraki, also the Crimean Ičel-Tats «speak with a specific singing tone that cannot be heard elsewhere in the Crimea».⁹⁷

The anthropological and ethnic difference between the Tatars and Tats is conspicuous. The Tatars are typically round-faced, short and dark, among the Tats prevail two types: the most characteristic feature of many of them is their high stature, fair hair and blue eyes.⁹⁸ The Nordic appearance of these people made Mándoki to liken them to the Swedes. The other type frequently found among the Tats does not resemble the Tatar type either: these have a thin face, sharp nose, less fair complexion, so that the overall impression is Iranian.

The conspicuous Nordic character suggests that the ancestors of this group might have been the Goths. But certainly not the ones who settled in Lesser Scythia in the middle of the first thousand years A.D. The Gothic language of those survived in Lesser Scythia for a long time; Ulfila, who translated the Bible into Gothic also lived here. The latest report about these Goths is due to Walafrið Strabo, a Frankish poet of the 9th century, who mentioned that there remained a small number of Goths in this area, who spoke the Gothic tongue, and as late as his time used the Gothic translation of the Bible.⁹⁹

After the ninth century ethnical stability or continuity in this area of stormy historical upheavals is improbable. The Goths must have become gradually slavonised, merged in the continuous flow of nomad Turkic tribes if they preserved in this area of constantly changing population at all. From

⁹⁵ Kondaraki, I/1, 125–128; XIII, 143.

⁹⁶ Drimba, 68.

⁹⁷ Drimba, 71; Kondaraki, I/1, 149.

⁹⁸ Drimba, 68.

⁹⁹ *Patrologia Latina* CXIV, col. 927 (apud Vasiliev, 38).

the 15th century on this coastal area was the main route of expansion of the Ottoman Turks towards Poland and the Crimea.

The possibility of local continuity of the ancestors of the Tats is also contradicted by the circumstance that the Tats adopted a distinct and specific dialect and not the language of the Tatars who lived in their close vicinity.

The other main argument against the local continuity of Tats is the tradition living among them as regards their origin with an exact location of their old country in the Baidar valley and the southern Içel coast in the Crimea.¹⁰⁰

The facts behind their specific anthropological character which sharply distinguishes them from the Tatar people should be looked for in their earlier history in the Crimea. In the light of the historical and geographical findings described so far the Baidar and Içel Tats may be classified an ethnical mixture of the ancient Gothic and Alan population who had adopted the language of the ruling class of the local Tatar tribe. This conclusion would solve the problem of the Nordic and Iranian traits of the Tats. The abundant literature dealing with the survival of the Goths (and Alans) in the Crimea, somehow ignored this anthropologic peculiarity of the Tat people living in the Dobrudja.

The Dobrudjan Tats are also strongly distinguished from the Tatars of this region by their occupation. According to the personal communication of St. Mándoki Kongur, the Tats are mostly merchants, craftsmen or farmers as opposed to the Tatars whose most typical occupation is animal husbandry. The Tats willingly take up hired work in the towns, the Tatars not.

The personal character of the Tats is also different: they are more earnest, even morose, and labour hard from morning till night.

All these anthropological and ethnical peculiarities are apparent at first glance not only to the scientific observer (linguist, ethnographer, anthropologist), but is felt also by the Tatars and the Tats themselves.

Although looked down upon the Tatar majority, the Tats are a self-conscious people. They willingly mix and intermarry with the Tatars, and thus the difference between them may disappear or at least become less conspicuous after a few generations.

4. The common noun or ethnic name *Tat* had different shades of meaning during its long history as shown by the early sources and up to modern times.

Two tendencies in the change of the meaning of the word might be postulated. One is an extension: Iranian ethnic element > neighbouring, subdued people (in general) and the other is a restriction from the general to the particular: neighbouring, subdued people > the actual neighbour.

¹⁰⁰ Kondaraki, I/1, 149.

With ethnic names the etymological deliberations may fail to reveal the origin, or the original meaning because many peoples adopted foreign names due to the intermingling of the tribes. The studies of V. Minorsky and H. H. Schaeder and the data described above suggest that there may have occurred an extension of meaning after all, issuing from the denotation of a special Iranian neighbour and resulting in an ethnic name denoting different peoples or ethnic groups alien to the Turko-Tatars as also shown by the case of the two different groups of the Crimean Tats.

5. The appearance of the apposition *tat birlä tavğač* among the titles of the Crimean Khans is unexpected.¹⁰¹ The word *tavğač* had been a frequent element of the titles of the Karakhanid khans. According to Barthold it signified the devotion towards the Chinese «state idea».¹⁰²

The ethnic name *tavğač* can hardly be expected to have preserved its original meaning during the thousand years of the history of the different Turkic peoples. The name of the Tavğač people who founded a state in North China as members of the Hsien-pi tribal confederation,¹⁰³ after their disappearance i.e. absorption into the local population, became to be attached to their conquered homeland.

The term *tavğač xan* in the Karakhanid titulature and further on did neither reflect the nomad origin, nor the Chinese affiliation, it only referred to the Central Asian homeland or empire,¹⁰⁴ intentionally implying the grand past and ancience.

A counterpart to this concentration of meaning to denote the empire notion might be found also in Indian and Persian (> Armenian) in the case of the coupled term *Čin-Mačīn*, and in Arabic *Šīn-Māšīn*,¹⁰⁵ referring to the empire of China and the adjacent subjected countries ruled by nomad chieftains, who have been soon absorbed into the Chinese commonwealth.

Two explanations might be offered to this late reappearance of this title (1627),¹⁰⁶ one historical, the other diplomatic.

The use of the title *tat birlä tavğač* by the Crimean khans was all the more peculiar since the southern coastline of the Peninsula, where the Tats lived, was under direct Ottoman rule, under the administration of the Beglerbey of Kaffa.

¹⁰¹ Kāšgarī, II, 224 ; III, 378 ; Kāšgarī/Atalay, I, 463. — Budagov, I, 329 ; Radloff, III, 899 ; Clauson, 449 ; — Minorsky, 756 ; Schaeder, 13 ; Pelliot, 155.

¹⁰² Barthold, 98.

¹⁰³ Ligeti, L., *Le tabgatch, un dialecte de la langue sien-pi: Mongolian Studies (BOH XIV)*, 265, sqq.

¹⁰⁴ Schaeder, 13–14 ; Pritsak, O., *Die Karachaniden: Der Islam XXXI*, 20.

¹⁰⁵ Kāšgarī, III, 378 ; Schaeder, 14 ; Clauson, 438.

¹⁰⁶ Véliaminov-Zernov, 31.

The virtual extension of the authority of the Kereis to the southern coast, or at least the stressing of the unity of the Tatar rule in the Crimea, was only possible in the period when the Crimean Khan was powerful enough for such a demonstration of his authority, or when he was allowed to do so by the balance between his land and the Ottoman sultans.

The power of the Ottoman empire was weakened at the beginning of the seventeenth century by several decades of war with the Persians (under Shah Abbas) mostly on Armenian territory. The signs of decline may be detected in the relation of the sultans with the Crimean khans. Muhammad Kerei III. (1623—27) khan rose in revolt against the sultan. (However the main role in this upheaval must be attributed to Šahin Kerei Qalgha, the actual ruler who had stood for several years in the service of the Persian Shah, so the incentive might have been fostered also by an outside party.) The toppling of the balance to the Khan's side was shown by the issue of the events: in spite of the dethroning ferman the Sultan ultimately was forced to confirm Muhammad Kerei in his khan's authority.¹⁰⁷ The pursuit of independence was even stronger under the khans who followed: Džanibek Kerei (1610—23, 1627—35), and Inayet Kerei (1635—37).¹⁰⁸

Accordingly, the title *tat birlä tavğač* first appeared in a document of Džanibek Kerei (1627). The title reflecting the aspirations for power of the Crimean khans became a standard formula in diplomatic and chancery practice: *Uluğ orda (ve) uluğ yurtñing ve Dešt-i Qipčaqñing ve taxt-i Qırımñing ve sansız köp tatarñing ve sağıšsız noğayñing ve tağ ara čerkesning ve tat bilä tavğačñing uluğ padšahı ve hem uluğ sultanı . . .* [The great padishah and great sultan of the Great Horde, the Great Yurt, the Dešt-i Qipčaq and the country of the Qrim, innumerable Tatars, countless Nogais, and Cherkesses in the mountains and Tats and Tavgač]. These titles were used as a cliché for centuries with only slight variations.¹⁰⁹

The perpetuation of this voluminous *‘unvān* might also be due to the development of chancery, and the practice of written records in the administration as a result of the personal contacts of Šahin Kerei with Persia as well as the cultural, diplomatic and trade connections with the Timurid, later Khwarezmian, empires. The intermingling of the Karakhanid with the Chingisid tradition and with the Timurid revival of the latter ought to be studied in depth.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁷ GOR, 36—37; Smirnov, 490. A vivid description of his reign by Khachatur the Armenian priest, s. Schütz, *Armenische Chronik: AOH XXIX*, 137, 144.

¹⁰⁸ Smirnov, 490 sqq., 511.

¹⁰⁹ Véliaminov-Zernov, No. 12, 13, 15, 16, 17 (A.D. 1628—1630), pp. 26, 31, 34, 41, 51, 62, 65; Nos. 47—57 (A.D. 1639, 1640); No. 148 (A.D. 1651), No. 231 (1670), etc.

¹¹⁰ Pritsak, *Die Karachaniden*, 20, 48, 52—55, etc.; Schaeder, 13—14; Broniewski: *ZOOID VI*, 353; Rizvan, 93.

The appearance of the attribute *tat birlä tavğač* at the end of the list of the titles of the khans¹¹¹ might raise doubts as to its importance in the demonstration of power. Anyway, this position might be attributed to the actual geographic situation: Tatars—Nogais—Cherkesses—Tats—Tavğač,¹¹² the last representing the ancient homeland. May be, they have been only included to make the list longer and thus more impressive.

As regards the semantic structure of the expression H. H. Schaeder called attention to the preference for alliteration, e.g. in the ethnic confederation Türk—Türgiř, and others.¹¹³ It might be added that such kind of alliterations for the sake of intensification are frequent in adjectives (*kap-kara* «pitch dark», *köp-kirmizi* «glaring red»). The use of doublets to suggest intensification of the meaning might be a feasible suggestion.

It should be noted that a similar pairing of words was popular when honouring other monarchs, for instance, in the same document the Tsar of all Russians was called: . . . *uluğ urusning ve purusning uluğ padşahi* . . . «the great emperor of the great Russians and Prussians . . .».¹¹⁴ The juxtaposition similar to *Tat—Tavğač* might be met with other Altaic peoples in a subordinated or coordinated relation to one another. The example of *tatabi qitai* might be quoted, in which the transformation of meaning *qitai* was similar to that of the word *tavğač*. The sequence of the ethnic names in these combinations did not indicate their relative importance, in some cases the name of the auxiliary tribe came first, just as in practice, the vanguard advanced first. It must be decided in each case individually what the points of view in coupling the names actually were, whether political, military or linguistic prevailed.

6. Popular etymological interpretations of different geographical names are frequently found in chronicles and travellers' accounts. These are not always the learned conjectures of the author, but often witty explanations they heard from the local population based on rhyming analogies or on superstitions.

There are few places in the Crimea which would have so many popular etymological explanation of their names as Kirker, later called Čufut-Kale. This may be attributed to the many spellings and pronunciations the name of the town had. The variants occurring in the travellers' accounts have been listed by Keppen: Kirker, Kerkri, Cherchiar(de), Chercher, Kirkyer, Kirkor.¹¹⁵

¹¹¹ Fekete, L., *Einführung in die osmanisch-türkische Diplomatie*, Budapest 1926, LV; Reyhman, J.—Zajackowski, A., *Handbook of the Ottoman-Turkish Diplomats*, 153, 158; Ivanics, M., *Formal and Linguistic Peculiarities of 17th Century Crimean Tatar Letters addressed to Princes of Transylvania: AOH XXIX*, 215—221; Matuz, 4.

¹¹² See the enumeration of the people under the scepter of the Khan, above p. 99.

¹¹³ Schaeder, 13.

¹¹⁴ Véliaminov-Zernov, No. 10 (p. 26); 11 (p. 31).

¹¹⁵ Keppen, 308—318; Smirnov, 102.

Speaking about Kirker in the land of Asses Abu'l-Feda (1321) noted that the name meant «forty men». Brun maintained that Abu'l-Feda was wrong in interpreting Kirker for «forty men». According to Vasiliev, it was Reinaud, Abu'l-Feda's French translator, who committed the error by his interpretation «quarante hommes».¹¹⁶ But this latter view cannot be accepted, because in the translation of Jacobus Reiske the same expression might be found: «Kerkri vox Turcica quadraginta viros notans, est arx munitissima».¹¹⁷ This explanation was then accepted and transmitted in the literature. For instance, Said Muhammad Riza repeated it in his work «The History of the Crimea» with reference to Abu'l-Feda.¹¹⁸

Although it may appear a pseudo-scientific conjecture, this etymology should rather be regarded as a popular tradition because it was widely known among the people, offering an easy solution to popular linguistic common-sense, *qırq* meaning in Turkish «forty» and *er* «man».

Different popular legends may also be taken in consideration with this explanation. On the flatland towards Kerch, near the Russian village Zuya, there is a cave called *Xırx aziz* meaning «forty Moslem martyrs». According to the legend, the forty martyrs were killed by giaours surprising them at prayer. Christians living in the vicinity maintain, however, that the cave used to be a sanctuary of forty Christian martyrs.

The mingling of legend and toponyms is at hand in the following case: the previous name of the Tatar village lying between *Aziz* and *Aq-Çoqur* was *Kirk(y)er*.¹¹⁹

The Karaims living in Čufut Kale seem to have adopted this common story enjoying wide popularity, and fabricated a legend of their own: the coat of arms over the main gate of the bastion was believed to commemorate the victory of forty Karaim families under Mengli Kerei.¹²⁰

Another popular etymological explanation of the city's name appears to be even more frequent and more ancient. This starts from another spelling, *Kirk-yer*, which is interpreted in Turkish as «forty places».¹²¹ Almost all medieval travellers mention this variety.

It is remarkable that Abu'l Feda himself mentions this version in another passage explaining the name Qirim: «The Crimea (Alkirim) is the name of a coun-

¹¹⁶ Abu'l Feda, 214; Abu'l Feda/Reinaud, 319; cf. Keppen, 309 (note 447); Brun, II, 135; Jakobson, *Sredn. Krym*, 81; Vasiliev, 166 (note 2).

¹¹⁷ *Abulfedae opus geographicum*. Ex Arabico Latinum fecit J. J. Reiske, apud Keppen, 309 (note 447).

¹¹⁸ Apud Smirnov, 104.

¹¹⁹ Kondaraki, I/1, 25; *ibid.*, 66 (note).

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 65–66.

¹²¹ Abu'l Feda, 200; Abu'l Feda/Reinaud, 282. Cf. Vasiliev, 166 (note 4).

try having forty cities». Rubruk also relates that there are «forty castles between Soldaia and Cherson». ¹²²

But in most of the accounts the expression «forty villages, places» is mostly understood to refer to the city Kirker alone, the later Čufut Kale. G. Barbaro in his valuable account reported that the Tatars had two places (surrounded with ramparts) in the Crimea, Solxat and Cherchiarde, the latter meaning «forty places» (*quaranta luoghi*) in their tongue. ¹²³

This toponym lending itself for such an easy popular etymological interpretation must have misled A. Vámbéry in his translation of the 1396 document of Timur Kutlug in Turkish: *Bu kündin ilgerü qırım birlä qırq-yerning tümenide sudaq atlıq kentning jevairindä* ¹²⁴ as «Vom heutigen Tage anfangen (sollen seine Söhne Ilki Hadschi Mehemed und Mahmud) in der Krim, im Bezirke der Vierzig Orte in der Umgebung des Ortes namens Sudaq . . . unabhängige Terchane sein». The words referring to Kirker ought to have been translated as «in the Tümen of Krim (here: Eski Krim, i.e. Solxat) and Kirker». This definition would have corresponded to the old Byzantine civil and ecclesiastical administrative district.

The interpretation of the chronicles is not unequivocal in the modern literature either. Based on the accounts of Abu'l Feda and Rubruk, W. Heyd maintains that the popular etymology of the name of Kirker and the forty Crimean places (*yer* «luogho, pl. luoghi») or forts (*castellum*) are two different things. ¹²⁵ A partly similar view is held by A. L. Jakobson, who made use of the account of Rubruk when reconstructing the history of the Crimea. From the 13th century onwards the Tauric Peninsula became divided into feudal estates, so Jakobson ventures the remark whether the forty castles (*quadraginta castella*) might not have been the mountain top residences of the feudal landlords, wherefrom they could dominate the people of the lowlands. ¹²⁶

H. H. Schaeder tried to solve the contradiction arising from the name of a single city and the meaning of forty castles by postulating that it, in fact, referred to forty places originally, the best known being Solgat, Sudaq and Kaffa, but later on the meaning became restricted to a single city. ¹²⁷

Already in 1880 Ph. Brun in his study «Notices sur la Gazarie» asserted that the *quadraginta castella* in Rubruk referred to Kirker. ¹²⁸ This was all the more acceptable because Rubruk himself had never travelled through the

¹²² Rubruk/Wyngaert, I, 170; Dawson, 93 (lines 1—2) «forty small towns».

¹²³ Barbaro, 129, 154 (§ 46).

¹²⁴ Vámbéry, *Uig. Sprachmon.*, 172—173. Cf. Radlov: *ZVOIRAO* 3 (1888), 19—21.

¹²⁵ Heyd, II, 209 (note 1).

¹²⁶ Jakobson, *Sredn. Krym*, 81; Idem, *Sredn. Chersones*, 31.

¹²⁷ Schaeder, 11.

¹²⁸ Apud Brun, II, 135 (note 53). Cf. Rubruk/Wyngaert, I, 170.

Peninsula, he only sailed along the southern coast and identified readily the popular etymology with the castles and ramparts he saw on the shore. Vasiliev also accepted this explanation, although — being historian not a linguist — he did not exclude the alternative that the name was restricted to denote Kirker only later on, and originally it meant the coastal region from Cherson to Sudaq.¹²⁹

It is not only the inaccuracy of the sources which justifies the indecision in the interpretation, but also a parallel lends itself for the changed meaning of a place name in the area, and the name of the Peninsula itself. The name *Krim* was originally used to mean a town, Solxat; later when the name was transferred to the denotation of the entire Peninsula, the town was called «Eski Krim» to distinguish the two notions. The original state of affairs is represented in the travel accounts of Martin Broniewski relating to 1578: «Cremum: Tartari ab eo loco Crimenses vulgo nunc appellantur [Krim, by the name of this place the Tartars now are called Crimeans]». ¹³⁰

When scrutinizing these main sources, it appears that neither Rubruk nor Barbaro did in fact travel widely in the Peninsula. Rubruk had seen only the city of Sudaq, and the northern steppe-region, while Barbaro secretly visited Kaffa (lying in the eastern end) on one occasion. Thus their accounts were based on the reports of Turkish informers who retold these popular etymologies to the travellers. So *yer* is commented as «place» by Barbaro, and «castle» (*castellum*) by Rubruk.

Other explanations of the name Kirker were also prevailing among the people. The variant *Kirkor* gave rise to the most frequent of these. In the reports of the Russian envoys only the velar variant was used. The second half of the word, *or* could mean «hole, pit, ditch» in the Turko-Tatar languages. Thus the name *Kirkor* was interpreted as meaning «forty caves». ¹³¹

This popular etymology might have been supported by the Nogai name of the Strait of Perekop, *Or* (*Orqapu* in Ottoman Turkish). In his «Crimean Chronicle» Riza offered the following explanation: *lisan-i tatar üzre xandaq ma'nasında olan or* «*Or* which means *xandaq* (= pit, ditch) in the Tartar tongue». ¹³²

The name of the village Kirker, in the vicinity of Aziz and Aq-Čoqur, might have contributed to the deriving of *Kirkor* from *Or*, the word *čoqur* being a synonym of *or* «ditch». ¹³³

¹²⁹ Vasiliev, 166.

¹³⁰ Smirnov, 59 sqq.; Keppen, 338—346; Broniewski/Schwandtner, 268.

¹³¹ Smirnov, 109—115, 334, 338; R I, 1046—1048; *Pamjatniki diplomat. snošenij*, 354, 379, 417, 419, etc.

¹³² Smirnov, 338, n. 5.

¹³³ Kondaraki, I/1, 66.

The abundance of cave-like forts carved in rock in the old Greek or even more ancient cities in the southwestern Crimea (Eski Kermen, Mangup, etc.) may have encouraged these conjectures. The origin and purpose of these caves have been subject to much debate. The expression «cave cities (peščernye goroda)» is common in literature and daily use. The subterranean part of the buildings in the fortifications carved into rock were originally used for military purposes, storage and later also for cult. The superstructures were demolished by the enemy and the erosion finished the job of destruction and in the end they in fact looked like caves. The Asses, Alans in Byzantine service, after the collapse of the rule of the Empire in the Crimea made use of these caves for dwelling purposes and even for sheep folds, and later the caves were taken in use by the sect of Karaites settled down in this town.¹³⁴

All the popular etymologies agree in interpreting the first half of the name of Kirker as «forty», but the word *qırq* also had a wide meaning of general use «many, numerous». Examples of this meaning are: *qırq ayaq* «centipede», or the place name *Qırq bulaq* which did not mean «forty springs» but «many», etc.

The multiples of forty, e.g. forty thousand, were frequently used in the description of army troops, where it evidently meant not the actual number but a multitude of threatening strength.¹³⁵

The origin of Kirker, Kirkor is most probably something what was suggested by Keppen: it probably has been derived from a Greek term: *Kirkos*. There are, however, no sources to prove this theory.¹³⁶

Kirker by this name was first mentioned as the estate of the beys of Yaslav. It became a district centre proper during the reign of the Kereis (Gireis). In the 15th century Mengli Girei moved his residence from Solxat to Kirker, Baxči Sarai only served as a summer residence of the Khan, the important diplomatic conferences were held in Kirker, where in the casemates the most precious prisoners (for whom the highest ransom could be stipulated) were also kept. This is where János Kemény, who was later to become the Prince of Transylvania, languished in prison and wrote in 1657 his «devout prayer» among «prisoners taken by the Tatar khan, who kept them in dreadful captivity in his residence in the land of Crimea, in the fort Čufut Kale built on a rock above the city of Bakčesarai.»¹³⁷

¹³⁴ Pallas, II, 72; Keppen, 247; Kondaraki I/1, 67; *Ist. i arx. Kryma*, 48, 52, 54.

¹³⁵ Keppen, 312 (note 454); *Hungaro-Turcica*, 188.

¹³⁶ Keppen, *ibid.*

¹³⁷ Kemény J., *Önéletírása és levelei* [Autobiography and letters], Budapest 1959, 391; Nagy, R., *A krími tatár rabok történetéből* [Hungarians in Crimean Tatar captivity], Losoncz 1918.

Bibliography

- Barbaro i Kontarini o Rossii, K istorii italo-russkich svjazej v XV v.* Podg. E. Č. Skržinskaja, Leningrad 1971.
- Barthold, W., *12 Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türken Mittelasiens*, Berlin 1935.
- Broniewski, Martin, *Opisanie Kryma: ZOOID VI* (1867).
- Broniewski: Schwandtner, J. G., *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum veteres, ac genuini*, Tyrnaviae 1765. vol. III, 247—298: *Descriptio Tartariae*.
- Brun, F. (Bruun, Ph.), *Černomorje, I—II*. Odessa 1879—1880.
- Clauson, G., *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Oxford 1972.
- Drimba, Vl., *Dialectul tat din Dobrogea: Fonetică și Dialectologie*, vol. III. Bucarest.
- Gavriil, A. Ch. i T., *Pereselenie Grekov iz Kryma v Azovskuju guberniju i osnovanie Gotijskoj i Kafijskoj eparchii: ZOOID I*, 1844, 197—204.
- Grigorovič/Blau: O. Blau, *Über die griechisch-türkische Mischbevölkerung um Mariupol. Nach W. Grigorowitsch's Bemerkungen über die Sprache der Taten: ZDMG XXVIII*, 576—583.
- Heyd, W., *Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen-âge*, I—II, Leipzig 1885—86.
- Hungaro-Turcica. Studies in Honour of Julius Németh*. Ed. Gy. Káldy-Nagy. L. Eötvös University. Budapest 1976.
- Istorija i archeologija srednevekovogo Kryma*, Red. A. P. Smirnov, Izd-vo AN SSSR, Moscow 1958.
- Jakobson, A. L., *Rannesrednevekovyj Chersones: MIA No. 63.*, Moscow—Leningrad 1959.
- Jakobson, A. L., *Srednevekovyj Chersones, XII—XIV vv.: MIA No. 17.*, Moscow—Leningrad 1950.
- Jakobson, A. L., *Srednevekovyj Krym*, Moscow—Leningrad 1964.
- Kāšgari: Maḥmūd al-Kāšgari, *Dīwān Luġat at-Turk* (transl. B. Atalay), I—III, Ankara 1939—1941, *Dizin*, 1943.
- Kāšgari/Brock.: *Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz*, bearbeitet von C. Brockelmann: *BOH I*, Budapest 1928.
- Keppen (Köppen), P., *Krymskij Sbornik*, SPbg 1837.
- Kondaraki, V. Ch., *Universalnoje opisanie Kryma*, SPbg 1895.
- Kononov, A. N., *Rodoslovnaja turkmen, Sočinenie Abu-l-Gazi chana chivinskogo*, Moscow—Leningrad 1958.
- Manr Žam.:* Hakobian, V., *Manr Žamanakagrut'yunner XIII—XVIII dd.* [Chronica minora saec. XIII—XVIII.], vol. I., Erevan 1951.
- Matuz, J., *Krimtatarische Urkunden im Reichsarchiv zu Kopenhagen (Islamkundliche Untersuchungen Bd. 37.)* Freiburg 1976.
- Minorsky, V., *Tāt: EI IV*, 755—759.
- Pallas, P. S., *Bemerkungen auf einer Reise in die südlichen Statthalterschaften des Russischen Reichs in den Jahren 1793 und 1794*, II. Leipzig 1803.
- Pelliot, P., *Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or*. Paris 1949.
- Radlov, V., *Jarlyki Toktamyša i Temir-Kutluga: ZVOIRAO III*, 1888, 1—40.
- Rubruk/Wyngaert: *Sinica Franciscana. Itinera et relationes Fratrum Minorum saeculi XIII et XIV.*, I. Quaracchi—Firenze 1929.
- Rubruk/Dawson: *Mission to Asia. Narratives and Letters of the Franciscan Missionaries to Mongolia and China in the 13th and 14th centuries*, Ed. Chr. Dawson, New York 1966.
- Schaeder, H. H., *Türkische Namen der Iranier: Festschrift Giese (Die Welt des Islams, Sonderband)*, Leipzig 1941, 1—34.
- Hans Schiltbergers Reisebuch*. Herausg. V. Langmantel, Tübingen 1885.

- Schütz, E., *Eine armenische Chronik von Kaffa aus der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts* : AOH XXIX/2.
- Schütz, E., *Tatok a Krim félszigeten* [Tat people in the Crimea]. Paper read on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the Chair of Arabic Studies of the University of Budapest, May 8, 1974.
- Smirnov, V. D., *Krymskoe chanstvo pod verchovenstvom Otomanskoj porty do načala XVIII veka*, SPb 1887.
- Spuler, G., *Die Goldene Horde. Die Mongolen in Russland, 1223–1502*. Leipzig 1943.
- Tizengauzen, V. G., *Sbornik materialov odnosjaščichsja k istorii Zolotoj Ordy*, vol. I. SPb 1884, vol. II. Moscow—Leningrad 1941.
- Vámbéry, H., *Uigurische Sprachmonumente*, Innsbruck 1870.
- Vasiliev, A. A., *The Goths in the Crimea*, Cambridge Mass. 1936.